

Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. Speaker, on April 30, the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] addressed the Yale University Law School alumni association.

In his words to his fellow alumni, our colleague outlined ably and understandably the role not only of the minority party in Congress, but also the place and perspective of each branch of our Government and its relationship to the others.

His theme was responsibility—the responsibility of the individual toward his Government, the responsibility of each of us in Government toward our fellow citizens and the responsibility of each separate branch of the Government toward the whole fabric of our Government and our constitutional objectives.

Because I believe these words deserve the close consideration of my colleagues, regardless of political affiliation, the address by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, YALE LAW SCHOOL ALUMNI DINNER, APRIL 30, 1965

When Governor Scrantom was here last year he said he would talk on a "safe subject"—politics. Being a peaceful man myself, and wishing to avoid controversy whenever possible, I, too, will stick to that safe subject.

But as House minority leader in the so-called age of consensus, I do have some ready views in the matter of differences of opinion and dissent in 1965 America.

Difference of opinion does make for horse-races—but for a republic to survive, something greater is required of its citizens. Our need is for responsible dissent.

In the Nation's Capital, we of the Republican Party recognize the necessity of informed and responsible opposition to Johnson administration programs. And we mean to fulfill our function as the party of opposition in a constructive and responsible manner.

But briefly let me address my remarks beyond the Capitol Hill scene. For we must all recognize a growing threat posed to our society and the country by irresponsible expressions of dissent in this time of national crisis.

I refer to the crisis in southeast Asia. It should be sufficient that our Nation's enemies know that the overwhelming majority of Republicans in Congress, though opposed to many of the President's domestic programs, support him in the matter of standing firm against aggression in Vietnam. In fact, it is worth commenting that President Johnson might wish for an equal amount of support for his Vietnam stand from members of his own Democratic Party.

I consider it incredible that a source of such irresponsible modern-day know-nothing dissent based on emotional disregard for the morality and facts of the case should spring from a few of our university campuses.

And I consider it appalling that much of the leadership for picketing with anti-American slogans in what at times amounts to irresponsible mob action comes from a small minority of university professors purporting to carry forward the banner of free academic inquiry.

Indeed, a central purpose of universities of free inquiry in our society is to prepare succeeding generations for the assumption of responsibility as citizens. Whenever our educational institutions fail to inculcate this sense of responsibility toward community

and Nation in their students, serious trouble for the Republic lies ahead.

This has been the case throughout history. This century offers tragic proof of the penalties which societies and nations pay for not meeting this fundamental requirement for existence.

During the recent Easter weekend demonstrations in Washington, some placards read: "Why Die for Vietnam?"

How many of us remember the similar question raised by irresponsible voices in Chamberlain's Britain, little over a quarter century ago: "Why Die for the Sudetenland?" and "Why Die for Danzig?"

We know now—and many of us did then—that these pacifist voices were serving the purposes of Nazi aggression. The placard-bearers cried for peace—while the seeds for Buchenwald and Belsen were taking root.

Today, our so-called teach-ins and peace demonstrations cry for peace—at any price—while the seeds of Communist atrocity take root. And yet the appeasers speak of morality.

Others are concerned with the physical uncleanness of these irresponsible protesters. I am not so much concerned with their personal hygiene as with their moral sterility. For if we condemn public apathy toward victims of street crimes, what can we say of apathy and disinterest regarding victims of Communist aggression?

It is, of course, an apathy and disinterest shown only by a small, small minority of American professors and students. The so-called teach-ins—which I regret to say may have begun at my own University of Michigan—are not truly representative of the Nation's university campuses. However, it remains for responsible leaders of American higher education to make this fact unmistakably clear to our people.

The well intentioned but unrealistic placard-carrying marchers who bear no public responsibilities cannot alter this country's policy in Vietnam. But a danger exists that they will bring about a damaging loss of public confidence in the aims and operation of the country's educational system. In addition their words and actions may lead to a dangerous miscalculation by the enemy of our Nation's course of present and future action. Such miscalculation by the Communists in Peiping or elsewhere could have dire consequences for all mankind.

Certainly there must always be a place for responsible dissent and free inquiry on our university campuses. But, as President Nabrit, of Howard University, pointed out this past week, there is no place for irresponsible disruption of academic pursuits on behalf of forces opposed to our system.

Dr. Wilson H. Elkins, president of the University of Maryland, expressed a similar idea saying that respect of students for authority and law is essential to the development of good citizenship and the "insidious erosion and sometimes outright defiance of authority is a dangerous trend in our society."

Dr. Elkins added: "It seems clear that if any student or group . . . is allowed to seize power in the name of freedom of speech, then the universities should close their doors before rigor mortis sets in."

It is not too much to expect university students to understand that along with free academic inquiry goes responsibility to country and society. And it is certainly not too much to expect their professors to know and teach that the prime master of free inquiry in Western society did not walk the streets of Athens carrying a placard asking "Why Die for Marathon?" when his community was threatened.

Indeed, Socrates knew the answer. He was prepared to do battle and if necessary die to preserve the freedom of others . . . yet my main thesis tonight is the need for responsible dissent in the age of consensus.

In the years ahead, as never before, we must beware of men with ready answers.

For we will still have to live—and find answers—under moral ground rules that were set down 20 centuries ago and under political ground rules that were set down 2 centuries ago.

Leaving the former to the theologians, I would like to make some comments on the latter.

The American Constitution was not divinely created. The Founding Fathers, after all, were merely mortals—why four of them were even Yale men. (Harvard had only three. Though we must admit that nine came from Princeton.)

The important point to stress when discussing the Constitution, I believe, is not that it has been sanctified by time and tradition. Nor need we dwell on its immutability—it can and has been changed from time to time. What is important is that it works. We have lived successfully and amicably under it. In a society that has always prided itself on pragmatism this is the ultimate test.

The keystone of our Constitution has been its system of balances—balances between levels of government and balances between branches of government.

Anyone who has ever worked with balances in a scientific laboratory knows that they are finely attuned instruments. One must be constantly alert to keep them in kilter; one must make immediate adjustments when there is a malfunction. Our governmental balances are no different in principle.

The legislative-executive-judicial balance, as established by our Constitution is a simple, yet ingenious, system of insuring our freedom.

Yet today there are disturbing signs of slow erosion in the power of the legislative, build-up of awesome power in the executive, and regrettable change in the intended direction of the judiciary. Each is a threat to freedom.

I think that much of today's criticism of Congress, the legislative branch, is a manifestation of our frustrations—the tensions of a prolonged cold war, the anomaly of poverty in the midst of plenty, the complexity of highly urbanized living, the gap between the American ideal of equality and its realization.

"Let's stop talking and get things done," we would all like to shout at one time or another.

But Congress, by design, is a deliberative body—435 Representatives in the House and 100 in the Senate who must reach majority decisions.

This criticism—that Congress is too cumbersome, too old fashioned—is basically unwarranted for two reasons.

First, because Congress has repeatedly proved that it can act with dispatch to meet crisis. You will recall, for example, that in the famous hundred days of 1933 some bills were voted into law even before they were printed.

Second, because the advantages of precipitous action are often outweighed by the safeguards of deliberate slowness.

In the race to the brink of decision one can easily fall over into the chasm of irresponsibility. It is to prevent this dangerous plunge that the Constitution provided checks and balances. It is only proper, when one stops to consider, that Congress should reach its major decisions after adequate research, thought, and full discussion.

After all, if the ultimate goal of government were merely speed, we could institute a dictatorship. What could be faster than one man giving an uncontested order?

When the balance in Congress is steeply tilted by an overwhelming majority in one political party—as it is today with 294

May 4, 1965

Democrats and 140 Republicans in the House—our system of checks and balances is further endangered.

This is because our two-party system, although not written into the Constitution, hurls into government an additional set of checks and balances. Early in our history a wise decision was made to follow the pattern of a two-party system. We avoided the loss of freedom of a one-party government; we avoided the chaos and confusion of a multiparty government.

Not only does a strong second party provide the electorate with legislative alternatives but also with a remarkably high level of honesty and frankness.

Without indulging in partisanship, I am sure we can all agree that a strong two-party system is democracy's life insurance—protection for our children against any drift toward authoritarianism. Conversely, a crushing overbalance of strength in either party for too long will make a mockery of our traditions in government and weaken the voice of the people.

This threat to the American system becomes even more serious when both legislative and executive branches are dominated by the same party.

The temptation for the President's majority in Congress to simply rubberstamp his proposals can become irresistible. Especially when the President is a master at the art of arm twisting—or, as the present incumbent calls it, "reasoning together." The recently passed Education Act is a case in point. We had such quick passage of a bill without Congress really working its will that many conscientious citizens feel raised more questions than answers. So we now hear talk of correcting the flaws with additional legislation. But this is hardly an adequate substitute for well-thought-out action.

We must also remember that the burgeoning growth of big government has given the President virtually unlimited resources for working his will. Besides the increased patronage and the increased leverage of administering massive spending programs, he now controls a veritable army of experts, researchers and propagandists whose job it is to present his administration in the best possible light to the American people.

Great power in a democracy should require great self-restraint. Yet only 2 weeks ago we were dramatically reminded that this is not always the case. I am referring to April 15—the day of reckoning for the American taxpayer. An incalculable number of citizens were then obliged to go into debt as a delayed result of Federal tax legislation with political overtones. What happened was that after the 1964 tax reduction was passed the administration wished to bask in the sun of voter gratitude, while muting the politically disagreeable fact that cutting the withholding tax would leave the taxpayer with a larger cash obligation to the Treasury on April 15, 1965, than in previous years. The administration's action—in allowing a false impression to exist—reminded Columnist Arthur Krock of a television commercial that used fake sandpaper in a shaving cream demonstration. But in the case of the commercial fakery, the Federal Trade Commission ordered the company to cease and desist. Nobody, however, required the administration to do likewise.

Today the President is kingpin of the branch of Government that employs over 5 million civilian and military personnel, with a yearly payroll cost of \$28 billion, and a total expenditure of over 127 billion tax dollars in fiscal 1966.

This is awesome power. Indeed. And if consistently used improperly could mean the withering away of our tripartite system of government and the eventual death of the two-party system.

It is also necessary to remember that while the President is Chief Executive of all of us,

he basically represents the views of only those who voted for him. (Many times this has meant less than a majority of the people.)

On the other hand, Members of Congress, and particularly those in the House of Representatives, are closer to the Nation's citizens. They are chosen by smaller segments of the Nation. In the House they are elected every 2 years. They represent every section of the country, rural and city, suburbs, blue-collar and white-collar, every major profession, doctors and lawyers, nearly every national origin, Protestant, Catholic, Jew, Negro, even American Indian.

This is your strength. It should not be diluted by an overbalance in the executive and judicial branches of Government.

While it is the duty of the legislative branch to enact laws, and the duty of the executive branch to administer laws, it is the duty of the third branch of Government, the judiciary, to interpret the laws.

Unfortunately there is evidence that the judicial branch is now arbitrarily elbowing its way into new positions of authority, and disregarding the wise suggestion of judicial restraint made by the late Justice Frankfurter and others.

When the Supreme Court ordered the States to reapportion on the "one-man, one-vote" concept, Justice Frankfurter, in a dissenting opinion, was critical of an assumption by the Court of "destructively novel judicial power."

"In this situation, as in others of like nature," Justice Frankfurter said, "appeal for relief does not belong here. Appeal must be made to an informed, civically militant electorate. In a democratic society like ours," he continued, "relief must come through an aroused public conscience that sears the conscience of the people's representatives."

Justice Frankfurter emphasized that the "Supreme Court's authority—possessed neither of the purse nor the sword—ultimately rests on sustained public confidence in its moral sanction."

It seems to me that the major goals to be sought in the area of government are twofold. First: a sensitive balance between executive, legislative and judicial branches; second: a strong two-party system.

As the goals are simple and straightforward, so, too, are the means of reaching them: a renewed sense of citizen participation at all levels of government; alert, enlightened and unfettered news media; self-restraint by those in positions of public trust; a general understanding of the workings of the American governmental system, so as to be able to detect deviations from it; and, above all, constant vigilance.

#### GEN. MILAN STEFANIK

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we pause in memory of the tragic death of Gen. Milan Stefanik, who certainly would have been a major figure in any nation. It is one of the tragedies of history that he was only able to claim a nation as his own for just a few years prior to his death.

General Stefanik was born in Slovakia, which was under foreign domination then as it is now. He was raised in a scholarly atmosphere and received his degree as doctor of philosophy from Charles University in Prague. Stefanik went to France in 1902 to live in freedom and after years of struggle he achieved great distinction as an astronomer and

did valuable research in Africa, the Americas, Europe, and the South Seas.

General Stefanik became a naturalized French citizen and joined the French Air Force in 1914 when war came to Europe. His distinguished record resulted in him receiving new honors, and he attained the rank of major general. He joined in the Czechoslovakia National Council with Edouard Benes and Thomas G. Masaryk. The independent State of Czechoslovakia grew out of this Council, and Stefanik became Minister of War. He was killed when his plane crashed on landing at Bratislava on May 4, 1919, where he was returning from a conference in Italy. In his tragic and untimely death, the Czechoslovak Republic suffered an irreparable loss of its most gallant and gifted soldier.

On the occasion of the 46th anniversary of his death, I am honored to join my Czechoslovak friends in paying tribute to the memory of this distinguished leader of his people and gallant fighter for freedom and democracy.

(Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

(Mr. MOORE'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE SENATE CONSIDERS ADMINISTRATION FIREARMS BILL

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the subject of gun legislation is of deep concern to citizens of New Hampshire. Hundreds of my constituents, sportsmen, collectors, dealers and other citizens, have written and spoken to me about it. They are opposed to the stringent provisions of the administration's bill, S. 1592, introduced March 22 by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. So am I. While it is generally agreed that some new controls over mail-order weapons may be in order, the administration's bill goes too far. It does not merely restrict the commercial traffic in hand guns and concealed weapons, it would outlaw all mail-order traffic to individuals.

The feeling that this is far too drastic a measure is reflected in the recent action of the Senate of New Hampshire in adopting resolutions of opposition to S. 1592. For 12 years I was privileged to be a member of the State senate and I submit these resolutions for the Record with approbation. I congratulate the senate for this forthright stand and hope this expression of sentiment will help to alert the House to the feelings of the country on this legislation:

Resolution relative to control of firearms  
Whereas there is an increasing agitation in Washington to pass bills to control the ownership and use of firearms, which are

cardinal rights of citizens of the United States; and

Whereas a new bill has been introduced into the U.S. Senate by Senator THOMAS J. DOWN, of Connecticut (S. 1592) which would prohibit all mail order sales of firearms to individuals, and permits such sales only between licensed importers, manufacturers and dealers, and places such severe and unreasonable restrictions upon reputable citizens who wish to order recreational firearms by mail; and

Whereas this bill, if passed and written into law, would give the Secretary of the Treasury, or his agent, virtually unlimited authority to regulate the sale of firearms by dealers which could result in the institution of stringent controls and prohibitions over such sales; and

Whereas the Founders of the United States in the very first amendment to the Constitution provided assurances for freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, and of peaceable assembly and in the second amendment they made it possible to defend these freedoms by providing that the rights of people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed; and

Whereas any firearms legislation at the Federal level restricting the purchase of firearms by responsible citizens would be a dangerous infringement of these articles of the Bill of Rights and which could lead to administrative decisions imposing such a burden on the sale, possession, and use of firearms for legitimate purposes as to completely discourage and eventually exclude the private ownership of all guns; and

Whereas such restrictive regulations as contained in the Dodd bill against firearms sales could have a crippling effect on the economy of the multimillion-dollar-a-year sales and services business associated with recreational use of firearms in the State of New Hampshire, and would only result in further loss of American liberty, add to the workload of our law enforcement and police forces, and inconvenience and penalize law abiding citizens; and

Whereas Federal excise taxes on sales of firearms and other forms of revenue from special licenses and stamps for recreational hunting provide many millions of dollars annually for the conservation and preservation of wildlife of all kinds; and

Whereas caution and prudence must be observed to protect the constitutional rights of the law abiding citizen from the possibility that legislating against the delinquent and the criminal does not result in legislating against the citizen of good repute: Now, therefore, be it

**Resolved,** That the ownership of firearms must not be denied reputable American citizens so long as they continue to use them for lawful purposes; and be it further

**Resolved,** That easy accessibility of firearms does not contribute significantly to the crime problem of the United States, and that the target for preventive legislation should be the crime, not the tool used by perpetrators of crimes, and that the members of the New Hampshire Senate go on record as opposing passage of the Dodd bill, which appears to be aimed at outlawing firearms rather than punishing the criminal who uses them for illegal purposes and, this Dodd bill could seriously impair the recreational economy of the State and Nation, infringe on the Constitutional rights of U.S. citizens, damage essential wildlife conservation programs, and intrude further Federal authority on powers reserved to the States; and be it further

**Resolved,** That any proposed new regulations should be studied carefully to see if they can accomplish a worthwhile purpose and not just result in further regimentation and inconvenience to responsible citizens; and be it further

**Resolved,** That the clerk of the senate be instructed to forward copies of these resolu-

tions to the members of the New Hampshire congressional delegation.

#### A RECORD VOTE FOR H.R. 7765

(Mr. RUMSFELD (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7765, which has just passed the House, provides for 1966 fiscal year appropriations of \$7,702,395,000 for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies. Because this important measure passed the House by a voice vote, I wish to record my support for H.R. 7765.

Further, I must state, as I have on a number of previous occasions, my strong disapproval of the technique of passing major bills—this one costing close to \$3 billion—without a record vote. The public's business should be conducted in public and the House does itself disservice when it fails to require record votes on major bills, thereby denying the people of this Nation information on how their Representatives voted.

#### NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS— PART LVIII

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the March 15, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

The article concerns the program to assist high school dropouts in New York City and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis."

The article follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 15, 1965]

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—FOR JOIN: A SLOWLY GROWING ACCEPTANCE

(By Sue Reinert, of the Herald Tribune staff)

In July 1963, Mayor Wagner and Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz held a joint press conference to announce a new program for unemployed, untrained high school dropouts—job orientation in neighborhoods.

The crux of the JOIN program was that instead of forcing the needy to come to the city for help, the city was going to go to the needy, right in their neighborhoods. Ten neighborhood centers would be opened to provide counseling, training, and placement for the jobless youths. Twenty thousand youths would be served in 15 months. The Federal Government would give \$2 million to the program and the city \$1 million.

"The program," said Secretary Wirtz, "tells them [jobless youths] things are going to be different. And I believe that they are."

As of January 31, 1965—18 months after the program was announced—10,145 youths had been accepted for the JOIN program. The number of placements was 2,830—a total that does not accurately reflect the number of persons placed in jobs because some JOIN youths have been placed several times. A JOIN study showed that only 40 to 45 percent of its youngsters remained on the jobs where they were placed.

The goal of 20,000 youths—so widely an-

nounced—was reduced to 8,000 in mid-1964 without the benefit of a press release. Federal money did not come in at the promised rate. When the Federal grant for JOIN ran out at the end of last month, Washington had paid only about \$780,000 to the program, although a spokesman in the Department of Labor said there were unpaid vouchers waiting for processing.

It was the city that bore the heaviest financial burden. The first \$1 million in 1963 was supplemented by another \$1 million for the fiscal year 1964-65; and the mayor just approved another supplement of \$280,000 for JOIN this year.

#### OPERATION SUCCESSFUL

Eight instead of ten centers were opened. The first opened in January 1964, instead of October 1963, as had been promised. The last, in Staten Island, opened last month.

David Jones, former deputy commissioner of correction and now the director of the JOIN program, says that JOIN has been "reasonably successful."

"It's not been a grand success," Mr. Jones said, "But of all the OMAT (Office of Manpower and Training of the Department of Labor) programs, it's been the only one attempting to work with large numbers of youngsters. We accepted all. We had to be innovative because the counselor staff is not sizable. (The professional staff totals 68—55 counselors, six testers, and five psychologists). We learned how to deal with these youngsters on a mass basis."

Mr. Jones said the reluctance of Federal officials to support the JOIN program stemmed from a difference of opinion between Washington and New York over what kind of people should direct JOIN centers. The Federal people wanted professionals; the city insisted on nonprofessionals who were "indigenous to the community."

The idea of having nonprofessionals run the JOIN centers was the work of Julius C. C. Edelstein, Mayor Wagner's executive assistant and the city official responsible for the JOIN program. Mr. Edelstein interviewed each applicant for the position of center director, which pays \$10,000 to \$11,000 a year.

To some observers this looked like an effort to put politics into the JOIN program, but Mr. Edelstein and Mr. Jones say it was done in order to provide community support for the program and thus to draw more youngsters to the JOIN centers. "The biggest intake was where we had the best community support," says Mr. Edelstein, "in East Harlem." (The East Harlem center was also the first to open.)

And whatever might have been suspected, the six directors who are now in office have no direct connection with politics. Some have worked for the city, almost all have been leaders in community or civil rights groups. One, Celia Vice, director of a Brooklyn JOIN Center, once was reportedly considering running for district leadership, but she was never elected.

What about the original JOIN goal of helping 20,000 youths? "There was no experience to go on," said Mr. Jones. "The other thing that wasn't anticipated was that it's a hard thing to set up a program in a city of the complexity of New York City. It soon became apparent to us that 20,000 was impossible."

Didn't reducing the goal bolster the cynicism of many slum youths who look upon city programs as empty gestures? "There was no effect on the youngsters," said Mr. Jones. "We didn't make any public announcement."

Mr. Edelstein considers the JOIN program so far a "learning experience." The city he says, has learned that such programs must include "employment at the end of the line" as an "incentive," and must be neighborhood-based.



Also, he says, "We've learned that you can't take these kids off the street and put them to work. Even after we've given them counseling and motivation, they still have to have the experience of sheltered work." Sheltered work? "The kind where they are not called upon to perform at the same level of output as they would be if they had to justify their employment economically to the employer," said Mr. Edelstein.

"Some people said these are political appointments," said Mr. Jones. "But the center directors are just people who have exerted some leadership in the community."

"This doesn't harm the program at all. City hall sees things that I couldn't possibly see—that's why Mr. Edelstein interviews applicants."

"Besides," said Mr. Jones, "Mr. Edelstein would be just as anxious as he to make good appointments, because city hall has got to have a successful program to rebound to the credit of city hall."

At the level of the individual center, the problems of policy and Federal support are not a matter of concern. Frank Di Bernardo, a counselor at the Corona JOIN Center in Queens, worries about the kids.

"These kids feel a kind of helpless passivity in the face of very rapid change," he says. "A lot of kinds come in here and just sit there at first. This is due to weeks, months of inaction. The counselor tries to give the kid action—to make him change from being passive and just waiting for things to happen to him."

The 55 counselors in JOIN centers are required to hold master's degrees in vocational counseling or a related field and to have at least 1 year of experience. Twenty-four of them have at least 3 years of experience, and 13 are senior counselors with at least 5 years. The testers must have a master's degree in clinical psychology and experience in working with tests, and the psychologists—some of whom double as testers—must have a doctorate in psychology.

The director of the Corona center is Leroy Carter, a 58-year-old Negro who was an officer of the local NAACP and a senior staff member of the city commission on human rights. Mr. Carter also is acting director of another JOIN center in South Jamaica.

At the Jamaica center one recent morning, a dozen young men and women were waiting to be processed. Most looked distrustful of the whole business. In a small cubicle office, Miss Mona Shub, the center's placement officer, said she had seen "real change" in the youth who came to the center.

"When I first came here," she said, "I would make 37 referrals—maybe 10 would show. Now I send 37 and 37 show. The youngsters are growing up a little."

Miss Shub said one of the persistent difficulties in helping the neighborhood youths was that many of them had police records and were hard to place. "In this particular neighborhood," she said, "a policeman picks up a kid for disorderly conduct, he fingerprints him and, bang, he's got a record. In a middle-class neighborhood, I don't believe a policeman would do that. . . . But if these kids can prove themselves in on-the-job training programs, I have been able to break down some employers who wouldn't accept kids with records previously."

The JOIN staff at both centers is extremely pleased with the new Neighborhood Youth Corps program, under which 5,400 youths will be employed part-time at city agencies and nonprofit institutions. The corps will take younger teenagers—from 16 to 18—who are difficult to place with private employers, and will also take the youngsters with records. "It's a Godsend," said Wister Smith, head counselor at Jamaica. "These kids will have some experience to point to after 5 months in a youth corps job."

Some of the Jamaica JOIN center applicants who have already been placed in

the youth corps program are working in the Jamaica YMCA. Five young men are working as maintenance men, cafeteria busboys, messengers, information clerks, and game room attendants. Three women are typists and clerks.

Mrs. Grace Madden, the YMCA office manager, said the JOIN youths were doing a "splendid job." Sandra Jones, 18, one of the typists, had never held a job before. Mrs. Eileen Johnson, 20, had worked briefly for a friend, and Sharelle Davenport, 20, had gone through a training program in the city, department of personnel.

One of the criticisms of programs like JOIN and the youth corps is that the jobs that youths are placed in are often menial and offer no opportunity for advancement. Mrs. Johnson, Miss Davenport and Miss Jones do not bear out that criticism. Each was asked what she would like to work at after the 5-month youth corps job was finished.

"Clerical, that's what I like," said Miss Davenport, a clerk.

"I'd like the same type of job I have now," said Mrs. Johnson, also a clerk.

In addition to providing jobs for JOIN youths, the Neighborhood Youth Corps program will also provide Federal money for the JOIN program—despite the fact that Federal officials in OMAT appeared reluctant to support the program. The money will be provided through a formula that allots one counselor to every 60 youths in the youth corps program.

This works out to considerable support. According to Henry Rosner, assistant to the Commissioner of Welfare and head of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program, JOIN has been allotted 64 percent of the youth corps placements—3,456 out of 5,400.

## NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LIX

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article discusses the opinion of one of the country's leading human renewal experts about the responsibility for New York City's economic and social problems.

The article appeared in the March 16, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis."

The article follows:

### NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—BUSINESS LEADERS BLAMED FOR CITY'S CRISES

(By Barry Gottehrer, of the Herald Tribune staff)

One of the Nation's top urban experts yesterday blamed the business leadership of New York for the city's growing crises.

"The business community of New York knows how to manage the most productive economy in the world, but they can't keep their own streets clean," said Edward J. Logue, development administrator of Boston and one of the pioneers in human renewal as opposed to slum clearance.

"They complain about New York's problems but they don't do anything about it," he went on. "New York doesn't need any more committees or special commissions. New York City needs a commitment by its business leaders. Businessmen have to become involved. They have to become partners."

"I know of no major city in the world—except possibly Calcutta—where the business leadership is less involved—is more needed—

and local government than they are in New York."

Mr. Logue, who helped pioneer the concept of human renewal in New Haven under Mayor Richard C. Lee before moving to Boston in 1961, delivered his indictment of New York's business community as guest speaker at the annual Pard Award luncheon in New York yesterday.

He did not, however, limit his criticism to the business men at the luncheon or during an interview immediately following it.

"It is time New York City stopped blaming public officials and started looking at the system itself," he said. "It is a mistake if we think that New York City is governed today under a charter. It is governed by Parkinson's law . . ."

The best government is one you can reach and touch and feel. New York City's urban-renewal program and everything else won't work if the officials can't reach and touch the citizens and the citizens can't reach out and touch you."

### FASHIONABLE TO BLAME MAYOR

Conceding that "it has become very fashionable today to blame Mayor Wagner for all of the city's problems," Mr. Logue, 44, a Democrat, felt that the mayor of New York was a man handicapped both by the system and by the city's size.

"It's possible to do a good job as mayor of Binghamton," he said. "I'm not sure it's possible to do a good job in New York. One of the best things for New York City to do is to boost Binghamton. Maybe some of the people will move then."

Unlike a great many public officials, who prefer to ignore the city's problems while discussing the difficulties of governing a city of 8 million, Mr. Logue tackled the problems of the city head-on.

"New York is dirtier, it's less attractive, it's a lot less safe, the air is more polluted and the traffic is no worse—only because it couldn't get any worse than it used to be," he said. "It's a sad feeling coming in here by plane and seeing all that pollution hanging up there over the city. Sure the problems are great, but New York is supposed to be a leader, not a follower."

As a start, Mr. Logue offered several possible suggestions—beginning with a firm commitment by business leaders and a realization that "they are at least in part responsible for the nightmare the city is becoming."

"The President asked for \$750 million in construction for the entire country," he said. "To get New York housing going again, it would probably require all of the \$750 million."

Short of this immediate financial commitment, Mr. Logue recommended a consolidation of New York's housing and planning arms in an attempt to cut through a maze of bureaucracy that is strangling the city and preventing progress.

In Boston—as in Philadelphia and a few other cities the planning and urban-renewal departments are consolidated—cutting red-tape, eliminating bureaucracy and speeding up construction.

In New York, the planning commission is still responsible for designating a site for urban renewal while the housing and redevelopment board is still in charge of carrying the program on from there.

In New York, this system has led to over-optimistic predictions, interdepartmental sniping, expanding payrolls and limited construction.

In Boston, the consolidation has not solved all the problems, according to Mr. Logue, but coupled with genuine human renewal program it has gone a long way to spurring the city's redevelopment.

As an example of the bureaucracy of New York's housing program and the almost insurmountable problems it creates he pointed